

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Christine M. Walsh,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	No. CV 03-440 TUC JMR (GEE)
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of Social)	
Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This case involves an appeal by Plaintiff from the Commissioner's denial of social security benefits. On October 15, 2007 Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment (Doc. No.29) and on February 22, 2008 Defendant filed a cross-motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 32, followed thereafter by an amended cross-motion, Doc. No. 37). On May 13, 2008, after a thorough and well documented analysis, Magistrate Judge Edmonds issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") to this Court. Neither party filed an objection to the R&R¹. Magistrate Judge Edmonds recommended that this Court deny Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and grant Defendant's cross-motion for summary judgment.

When there are no objections to the R&R, the Court will modify or set aside only those portions that are clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed.

¹On June 2, 2008 Plaintiff did file a request that "any and all monies for case NO CIV 03 440 TUC JMR (GEE) if any, be made payable to the DePaul University" (sic). This request does not constitute an objection, and even if the court were to construe it as one, it provides absolutely no basis to challenge the analysis and conclusion of the magistrate judge in this case.

R. Civ. P. 72; *Johnson v. Zema Systems Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999); *Conley v. Crabtree*, 14 F.Supp.2d 1203, 1204 (D. Or. 1998). The Court has carefully reviewed the entire record and concludes that Magistrate Judge Edmonds' recommendations are not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. The Court agrees that there is substantial evidence to support the ALJ's conclusion that Plaintiff is not disabled.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION** of Magistrate Judge Edmonds (Doc. No. 39) is **ADOPTED**.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 29) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 32, 37) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's motions for entry of judgment (Doc. Nos. 20, 22, 24) are **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

DATED this 5th day of June, 2008.



John M. Roll
Chief United States District Judge